(Rs in lakhs)

Year	Item	No of works taken up	Amount	Remarks
	Towards matching State share for submission projects	17	2068.82	Completed
	Potiadurthy scheme of Cuddapah	1	28.00	Completed
2002-03	Projects	29	8405 00	Under progress
	Schemes	110	1415 00	Under progress

(c) The Planning Commission is coordinating the Pradhan Mantri Gramodaya Yojana (PMGY) from 2002-2003. Planning Commission have devised a comprehensive system of physical and financial monitoring for the Pradhan Mantri Gramodaya Yojana. The State are required to furnish six monthly progress reports on each of the six components of PMGY including rural drinking water supply.

Watershed Development Projects for Tamil Nadu

391. PROF. M. SANKARALINGAM: Will the Minister of RURAL DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have sponsored any evaluation study on Watershed Development Projects in Tamil Nadu keeping in view the water shortages;

(b) if so, the findings of such a study,

(c) the funds allocated for the watershed development projects during the current year, State-wise,

(d) whether the Ministry has received any proposals from Tamil Nadu in this regard; and

(e) if so, the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT (SHRI ANNASAHEB M.K. PATIL): (a) and (b) In Tamil

Nadu, the Integrated Wastelands Development Programme (IWDP) and the Drought Prone Areas Programme (DPAP) are being implemented. Under these programmes, evaluation studies are conducted in watershed project areas to assess the performance of on-going projects. In addition, a general impact assessment study was also sponsored by the Ministry of Rural Development which was conducted by the Centre for Management Development, Thiruvanthapuram in 17 districts of Tamil Nadu (covering 12 districts of DPAPand 5 districts of IWDP) for projects sanctioned during the period from 1 4 1991 to 31.3.1998

The impact assessment study reveals that the watershed projects in general have had a positive socio-economic impact on the farming community and others living in the watershed areas Overall productivity of land has increased. The water table has gone up and there has been a positive and significant impact on the overall economic development of the people living in the project areas. It has also been reported in the study that the average operational, arable and irrigated land holdings of the beneficiaries have increased. Further, it has not only recharged the ground water leading to increase in drinking water availability but also availability of water for irrigation. This has resulted in increase in yield of crops, availability of fuel and fodder and also increased livestock population in the project areas

(c) Since watershed development projects are demand driven, State-wise annual allocation of funds is not made under IWDP, DPAP and DDP programmes. State-wise details of funds released for on-going watershed projects under these programmes during the current financial year i.e 2003-2004 (as on 18.07.2003), are contained in the Statement enclosed. (*See* below)

(d) and (e) During 2002-2003, 11 districts of Tamil Nadu were prioritized in consultation with the State Government for sanction. Due to shortage of funds, no new projects were sanctioned during that year. However, out of 11 prioritized districts, 9 districts *viz.* Theni, Dindigul, Coimbatore, Dharmapur, Salem, Thiruvallur, Thiruvannamalai, Ramanathapuram and Madurai (West) are eligible for sanction during the current financial year i e. 2003-04 subject to availability of funds In so far as DPAP is concerned, new watershed projects are sanctioned on the basis of past performance of the watershed projects and area coverage in already identified blocks of Tamil Nadu State. So far, no

new watershed project has been sanctioned under DPAP during the current financial year i.e. 2003-04.

Statement

State-wise funds released under IWDP, DPAP and DDP during 2003-2004 (as on 18.7.2003)

(Rs in Lakhs)

Sl.No.	State	IWDP	DPAP	DDP
1.	Andhra Pradesh	382.37	1344.81	195.43
2	Arunachal Pradesh	0.00	-	-
3.	Assam	0.00	-	-
4	Bihar	0.00	42.94	-
5.	Chhattisgarh	166.01	189.00	-
6.	Gujarat	280 47	771.45	893.56
7	Himachal Pradesh	38.72	26.89	115 42
8.	Haryana	70.43	-	639.75
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	67 56	-	312.95
10.	Jharkhand	0.00	326.04	-
11	Karnataka	439.82	327.07	443 97
12	Kerala	96.87	-	-
13.	Maharashtra	139.41	127.89	-
14.	Madhya Pradesh	380 31	1100 29	-
15.	Manipur	65.75	-	-
16	Meghalaya	0.00	-	-
17.	Mizoram	0.00	-	-
18.	Nagaland	0.00	-	-
19.	Orissa	37 14	262.03	-
20.	Punjab	25.44	-	-
21.	Rajasthan	343.66	488.66	1618.32

Sl.No.	State	IWDP	DPAP	DDP
22.	Sikkim	0.00	-	-
23.	Tamil Nadu	499 12	438.80	-
24	Uttar Pradesh	492 46	427 30	-
25.	Uttaranchal	93 88	0 00	-
26.	West Bengal	0.00	0 00	-
	TOTAL	3619 42	5873.17	4219.40

Implementation of Poverty Alleviation Programmes in Orissa

392 SHRI RAMACHANDRA KHUNTIA: Will the Minister of RURAL DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government are aware of alleged rampant corruption in implementation of Poverty Alleviation Programmes in all the 10 Blocks of Jajpur District of Orissa especially in Korai and Badachana Blocks;

(b) if so, whether Government have received certain complaints in this regard;

(c) whether Government have also received such complaints from certain blocks of KBK districts and Western Orissa;

(d) If so, the details thereof; and

(e) the fresh steps taken by Government for proper implementation of Poverty Alleviation Programmes in Orissa?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT (SHRI ANNASAHEB M.K. PATIL) (a) No, Sir

(b) The Ministry of Rural Development has not received complaint about the rampant corruption in implementation of Poverty Alleviation Programmes in the 10 Blocks of Jajpur District of Orissa including Korai and Badachana Blocks

(c) No, Sir

(d) Question does not arise